

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,908
Docket No.: 11573-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected all pending claims 1-9. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 7-9 under 35 U. S. C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Admitted Prior Art (APA). The Office Action rejected claims 3-6 under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Farnworth (U. S. Patent 6,815,327). Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 9. After entry of amendments, claims 1-9 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, and 7-9 under 35 U. S. C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Admitted Prior Art (APA). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

In FIGs. 3 and 4 of the present invention as the examples, the spacing pad 216 is not over the top surface of the passivation layer 204a. In other word, the spacing pad 216 is flat pad to prolong the bonding pad 210. As a result, when the bonding conductive structure, such as the UBM layer 220 and the bump 230, is formed later, the conventional sharp angle 108 can at least be significantly avoided (see FIG. 1).

In re APA (FIG. 1), the adhesive layer 122 is considered as the spacing pad by the Office

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,908
Docket No.: 11573-US-PA

Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Actually, the adhesive layer 122 is a part of the UBM layer 120 but not provides the function of spacing pad of the present invention.

Further, the adhesive layer 122 has crossed over the top surface of the passivation layer 104. The claimed spacing pad 216 is not crossing over the top surface of the passivation layer.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 9 have distinguished over APA. With at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2 and 7-8 patently define over APA as well.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

The Office Action rejected claims 3-6 under 35 U. S. C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Farnworth. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

With at least the same reason applied to independent claims 1 and 9, APA does not disclose the whole features of the present invention.

In re Farnworth, Farnworth in FIG. 2h also failed to disclose the spacing pad of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the same foregoing reasons, claims 3-6 are patentable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 9 patently define over the prior art, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-8 patently define over the prior art references as well.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/710,908
Docket No.: 11573-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-9 of the invention patentably define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date : March 15, 2005



Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw